Exhibit 8 Public Redacted Version

	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4	x
5	IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE Case No.
	ANTITRUST LITIGATION 3:21-md-02981-JD
6	
_	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: MDL No. 2891
7	
•	Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC,
8	et al.,
9	Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD
3	In re Google Play Consumer
10	Antitrust Litigation,
10	Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD
11	
	In re Google Play Developer
12	Antitrust Litigation,
	Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD
13	
	State of Utah, et al.,
14	v. Google LLC, et al.,
	Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD
15	
	Match Group LLC, et al.,
16	v. Google LLC, et al.,
1 -	Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD
17	
10	x
18 19	*HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER*
20	"HIGHLI CONFIDENTIAL - UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER.
21	REMOTE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION BY VIRTUAL ZOOM OF
22	PURNIMA KOCHIKAR
23	Wednesday, August 31, 2022
24	
25	Reported By: Lynne Ledanois, CSR 6811

	Page 14
1	PURNIMA KOCHIKAR,
2	having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
3	
4	EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. MOSKOWITZ:
6	Q Good morning, Ms. Kochikar. My name is
7	Lauren Moskowitz, as you heard. I represent Epic
8	Games and I'll be starting your deposition today.
9	If you could just please state your full
10	name for the record.
11	A Purnima Kochikar.
12	Q And can you provide your address, please?
13	A
L 4	
15	Q Thank you. Today we'll be I'll be
16	asking you questions, you will be providing answers.
17	I'm going to do my best to avoid speaking over you.
18	I may do it if I can't tell you were done.
19	But I would ask that you try to also wait
20	for me to finish my question before you start your
21	answer.
22	Is that okay?
23	A Yes.
24	Q And please, if at any point you don't
25	understand one of my questions, please ask me for

	Page 21
1	A Just the conversations. I'm very well aware
2	of things like blip points and other things we do to
3	benefit the ecosystem.
4	Q So other than what you already had
5	personal knowledge of, did you do anything to get up
6	to speed as to Google's overall corporate knowledge
7	on this topic?
8	A No.
9	Q Did you speak to any Google employees
10	about this topic?
11	A No, I haven't.
12	Q Do you recall when you first learned about
13	the lawsuits that bring us here today?
14	A Yes.
15	Q When was that?
16	A August, September 2020.
17	Q Was it the same day that they were
18	initiated?
19	A I don't know if it's the same day, but it
20	was when I was told to have documents holds.
21	Q Do you remember when you were told to have
22	document holds?
23	A Similar time, August, September 2020.
24	Q Did you follow the instructions in that
25	litigation hold?

	Page 22
1	A Yes.
2	Q Did you take any steps to change any
3	settings for your instant message software?
4	A No.
5	Q Did you have your default setting to
6	delete chats every 24 hours?
7	MS. NARANJO: Object to form. You can
8	answer.
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	BY MS. MOSKOWITZ:
11	Q Have you discussed this lawsuit with
12	anyone other than Google's lawyers?
13	A No.
14	Q Have any developers ever asked you any
15	questions about this lawsuit?
16	A No.
17	Q Never?
18	A No.
19	Q Are you aware of any investigations
20	underway about the Google Play Store in any way?
21	A Yes.
22	Q And what investigations are you aware of?
23	A The more recent conversations with the DMA,
24	for example.
25	Q I'm sorry, I didn't catch the acronym.

	Page 91
1	A I believe that Facebook has the ability to
2	update itself, but I think it's got something to do
3	with preloads that they get with OEMs. That's my
4	understanding.
5	Again, as I said, I'm not the person who's
6	the expert on how Android distribution happens
7	beyond the Play Store. That's the only one that
8	comes to mind for me.
9	I can't recall anything else.
10	Q Separate from this call with Mr. Rein, did
11	you have any direct conversations with Mr. Sweeney
12	about the issues with direct downloading?
13	A I was not involved in any conversations with
14	Mr. Sweeney.
15	Q Was anyone at Google involved in those
16	discussions?
17	A I know that there was several conversations
18	with Mr. Sweeney between Jamie and several other
19	leaders at Google, but I wasn't directly involved in
20	those conversations.
21	Q Google decided to offer Epic a bespoke
22	deal in July 2019 excuse me, July 2018; right?
23	A Yes.
24	Q And that offer, that deal proposal was
25	approved by Google's Business Council?

	Page 92
1	A Yes.
2	Q And the terms of the deal, at least in
3	part, would have required Epic to launch on Google
4	Play in exchange for various incentives related to
5	Google's other product lines of business?
6	A It was a co-investment to help Android get
7	better and Fortnite be successful on Play.
8	Q Part of it was a requirement that Epic
9	launch Fortnite on Google Play?
10	A Yes, but not exclusively. They could
11	continue to do everything that was being planned like
12	direct downloads, launch through Samsung, any other
13	store, et cetera.
L 4	This was just a matter of us leaning in to
15	make Android better and Play be an additional
16	channel for Fortnite.
17	Q Launching on Google Play would have
18	ensured that most of the downloads happened through
19	Google Play; correct?
20	A Probably.
21	Q Epic did not accept the deal; right?
22	A No.
23	Q With respect to going back in time a bit
24	to your early time at Google in the 2012 and 2013
25	period, had you had an understanding as to the

	Page 104
1	earlier that had a list of projects including
2	Project Hug, games velocity, et cetera?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And I didn't ask you then, but can you
5	tell me now what did you to prepare to testify on
6	this topic specifically with respect to the velocity
7	programs and Project Hug?
8	A It's my day-to-day work.
9	Q So you had personal knowledge of this and
10	didn't need to do anything else to study up on it?
11	A No.
12	Q Games Velocity Program is also known as
13	Project Hug and vice versa?
L 4	A Yes.
15	Q And Project Hug has also been referred to
16	as Project Bear Hug?
17	A Maybe for a tiny moment.
18	Q That was in the beginning?
19	A Yes. Project names are an odd thing of how
20	people come up with things.
21	Q Whose idea was the Hug name for this
22	project?
23	A I don't remember. I'm sure it's some
24	strategy team.
25	Q The overall project, though, regardless of

	Page 105
1	the naming convention was Mr. Rosenberg's idea; is
2	that right?
3	A Actually, the overall idea came from the
4	conversation we had with Epic in trying to figure out
5	how to truly make Epic successful.
6	We had leaders from across Google think
7	about ways we could add value to Epic and Fortnite.
8	And although Mr. Sweeney declined, we asked
9	ourselves, why wouldn't we lean in to make Google
10	better for our partners.
11	And it was along the lines of what we had
12	conversed with Mr. Sweeney, even though I wasn't
13	there in those meetings.
14	Q So were you involved in Project Hug from
15	the beginning from your perspective?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And how would you describe your role in
18	the project?
19	A Threefold, we identified the value Google
20	can provide partners, we figured out how to
21	operationalize that value and then we identified a
22	small group of partners who are very important for our
23	users and that means users are spending time, they're
24	spending money and that is growing as the candidates
25	to test whether a hypothesis is right.

	Page 106
1	Q And what was the hypothesis?
2	A That Google collectively can be of higher
3	value to our partners.
4	Q And when you refer to Google collectively,
5	you mean bringing other areas of Google outside of
6	Google Play to supplement the value provided to
7	those developers?
8	A To help developers grow. So that is about
9	velocity. So it was all about developers and Google
10	co-investing. For every component of the deal, there
11	was co-investment.
12	So, for example, there would be
19	So it was co-investment to grow. And we
20	believed that collectively we could increase the
21	velocity of the developers' growth.
22	Q There was also studies done about what the
23	value Google Play was providing to its developers;
24	correct?
25	A We're constantly looking at it at different

	Page 119
1	Q And that was him adding you into a
2	conversation initiated by Mr. O'Connor to him?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And you your response to Mr. Marchak
5	starts on the prior page literally with a "Hi Mike"
6	and the meat of it is on the page ending 931.
7	Do you see that?
8	A Yes, give me moment, please.
9	Q Sure.
10	A Yes.
11	Q So the timing of this email on February
12	2019, this is a couple of months, probably two
13	months before a Business Council presentation on
14	Project Hug. Is that consistent with your
15	recollection?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And there's discussion in here at the top
18	of your email about sort of how to present Hug to
19	the Business Council.
20	Do you see that?
21	A Yes.
22	Q You say that you told Mr. Ahmed in
23	connection with how to present Hug to the Business
24	Council that you quote, "cannot just anchor on
25	risk."

	Page 127
1	large developers who are very committed and think we
2	provide a lot of value.
3	Q Were you part of the team that presented
4	Project Hug to the Business Council?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And was that April 9th, 2019?
7	A Yes, around that time.
8	Q And the Business Council subsequently
9	approved Project Hug; right?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And Project Hug was targeted to 22 large
12	game developers at that time?
13	A Yes.
14	Q And the idea that Google had was not to
15	reduce revenue share for those developers because
16	there was a risk that doing so would lead to
17	contagion of other developers asking for similar
18	reductions; right?
19	A We always want to do things equitably. We
20	want to focus on growth first and so we said, take
21	some of this large developers, see how Google can add
22	value, understand where we can take it and then decide
23	where to go with it.
24	Q And one of the ways that Google presented
25	the Hug developers with the value proposition of the

	Page 128
1	Hug arrangement was to show what their effective
2	revenue share would be below 30 percent; correct?
3	A No.
4	Q You've never seen charts of what the
5	effective revenue share would be for Hug developers
6	with all the benefits across platform, across
7	Google?
8	A We may have internally done it. Whenever we
9	presented to developers, if you use the presentations
10	that I have been part of, we always focused on growth
11	and
12	Q Sorry, go ahead.
13	A And growth and co-investment.
14	Q And the developers, though, in
15	communicating with Google did talk about and it in
16	terms of effective revenue share; correct?
17	A I can only think of maybe one or two out of
18	the 22.
19	Q is one of them?
20	A
23	They have actually doubled down more than
24	anything else.
25	Q is another one?

	Page 129
1	A didn't accept Hug at all.
2	Q No, but they were a Hug developer
3	targeted; correct?
4	A They were a Hug developer, we had a
5	conversation. decision to say no had as
6	much to do with the fact that they had already
7	committed to someone else for and they didn't
8	see the value.
9	None of this was it was all à la carte.
10	People could pick and choose what they wanted and so
11	with , we needed to think differently about
12	where we could add value for them.
13	Q I'm trying to figure out at the moment
14	we'll talk about that later.
15	I'm just trying to figure out who were the
16	developers that raised what their effective revenue
17	share would be in the context of the Hug
18	negotiation?
19	was one. Who was the other one that
20	you have in mind?
21	A A
22	Q Okay. So other than ,
23	there are no other developers that come to mind that
24	talked about the benefits from a Hug deal in terms
25	of reduction of their revenue share?